

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of DONTRALE DONTAE  
MITCHELL, DAYON LEREN MITCHELL, and  
DYMOND DONTRICE MITCHELL, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED  
June 17, 2003

v

SHERIKA LAQUADA THOMAS, a/k/a  
SHERIKA LAQUANDA THOMAS,

No. 243234  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 99-381659

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DONALD O'NEIL MITCHELL,  
  
Respondent.

---

Before: Sawyer, P.J., and Meter and Schuette, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the circuit court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The circuit court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I) (now MCR 3.977[J]); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Respondent-appellant failed to secure permanent housing and employment in the nearly three years her children were in foster care. Furthermore, she did not consistently attend counseling, which was required as part of her parent-agency agreement. It was only in the last four months the children were in foster care that respondent-appellant made any progress in acknowledging her responsibility for her children's malnourishment and neglect. However, she still did not achieve substantial compliance with her parent-agency agreement.

Furthermore, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Although there was evidence of a bond between respondent-appellant and her children, she was not able to make substantial improvements to ensure the safety and welfare of her children in the nearly three years that the children were in foster care. It was not in the best interests of the children to remain temporary wards of the state in order to allow respondent-appellant more time to demonstrate her ability to care for them. Thus, the circuit court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ David H. Sawyer  
/s/ Patrick M. Meter  
/s/ Bill Schuette